Action Item

- Acceptance Transaction Requirements Document
  - Develop a set of requirements for a structured Acceptance/Rejection transaction.

Team Members

Andy Zajaczkowski (lead)
Evelyn Thompson
Mark Robinson
Greg Tsiknas

WAWF/UID/RFID Industry Group Meeting

Consensus Requirements

•Send an EDI/FTP/electronic response reflecting documents accepted as well as documents rejected.

•Information on the response to be the same as the existing emails that are sent from WAWF reflecting acceptance or rejection. This should be the equivalent of the: Subject: WAWF Import(s): X Successful Import(s), X Failed Import(s)   message. This seems to be WAWF's "997" and it would greatly facilitate automatic processing of transactions and data analysis.

•Review DoD's current Implementation Conventions for the 824 and 864 transaction sets.

•Bottom line: Need to be able to have a closed loop audit trail for transactions sent to WAWF.

Other Suggested Requirements

•Include ISA Qualifiers, GS, ReceiverID and the VAN name for the original transmission to WAWF in the payload of the 824/864.

•Include in the payload of the 824/864, the source Interchange Control Number, Group Control Number, and Transaction Set Control Numbers.

Discussion Points

•Is this possible in an 824/864? A 997can return control numbers as part of the receipt process at EDI translation, but and 824/864 are standalone transactions created by the receiving application after EDI translation and usually don't have those control numbers available.

•Add a field(s) in CCR as a means of enabling the structured notification and establishing the ISA/GS identifiers to which to send them. This would overcome the potential roadblock should GEX be stripping off the envelope information from inbound transactions. CCR settings, while not a perfect solution, would provide at least a minimally workable mechanism for FTP, allowing FTP users to retrieve status messages via X12. This would not provide a control number for FTP transactions. However, that is a deficiency that could be corrected in the UDF definition. This would principally benefit X12 users, fitting in to the inherent design of the X12 transaction process.

•This would not give the control numbers or do anything for FTP.